

THE  
REAL GROUNDS  
OF THE  
PRESENT WAR  
WITH  
FRANCE.

[ PRICE EIGHTEEN-PENCE. ]

THE  
REAL GROUNDS  
OF THE  
PRESENT WAR

WITH  
A JOHN FOWLER  
F. R. A. N. C. E.

[PRICE EIGHTEEN PENCE.]



THE  
REAL GROUNDS  
OF THE  
PRESENT WAR  
WITH  
FRANCE.

---

By JOHN BOWLES, Esq.

---

LONDON:  
PRINTED FOR J. DEBRETT, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON-  
HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

---

1793.

# REAL GROUNDS

OF THE

the success of a Free People  
 depends greatly upon their  
 conviction of its importance, its  
 and its justice. To produce these  
 they must thoroughly understand  
 and its object; the causes that  
 and the consequences it involves  
 judgment being thus formed  
 feelings engaged in its favour, to  
 to support it with an ardent and  
 which almost ensure its success  
 only a Free People can display.

JOHN BOWLES, M.P.

to promote a general and  
 consideration of the circumstances that  
 present contest, and of the important  
 which depend upon its prosperous  
 following Reflections are respectfully  
 mitted to the public notice.

PRINTED FOR J. DEBENT, OPPOSITE BIRMINGHAM  
 March 21 1833. RICHARDSON.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

**T**HE success of a Free People in War depends greatly upon their general conviction of its importance, its necessity, and its justice. To produce that conviction, they must thoroughly understand its grounds and its object ; the causes that produced it, and the consequences it involves. Their judgment being thus satisfied, and their feelings engaged in its favour, they are likely to support it with an ardour and an energy which almost ensure its success, and which only a Free People can display.

To promote a general and impartial consideration of the circumstances that led to the present contest, and of the important interests which depend upon its prosperous issue, the following Reflections are respectfully submitted to the public notice.

*March 7, 1793.*

ADVERTISING

THE success of a Free People in War depends greatly upon their general conviction of its justice, its necessity, and its justice. To produce that conviction they must thoroughly understand its grounds and the consequences it involves. Their judgment being thus satisfied, and their feelings engaged in its favour, they are likely to support it with an ardour and an energy which SURVEY of the actual situation of each only a greater part of Europe. It is calculated to excite the liveliest apprehension, and the keenest jealousy, in the breast of every friend to humanity. It is not merely the fatalities of warfare, not the ravages of desolating armies—not the blood, staining the fall of Empires, that fill the mind, but the suffering of the millions who are the victims of the sword. Such evils have often occurred, and, however dreadful in their progress and effects, have gradually subsided, and in the natural course of things, given way to peace. But an evil, as unprec-



---

---

T H E

REAL GROUNDS, &c.

---

**A** SURVEY of the actual situation of a great part of Europe, is calculated to excite the liveliest apprehension, and the keenest sensibility, in the breast of every friend to humanity. It is not merely the calamities of war—not the ravages of desolating armies—nor the shock attending the fall of Empires, that disturb the tranquillity and menace the welfare of this quarter of the globe. Such evils have often occurred; and, however dreadful in their progress and effects, have gradually subsided, and, in the natural course of things, given way to peaceful and orderly scenes. But an evil, as unprece-

B

dented

dented in its nature as alarming in its tendency, was reserved for the experience of modern times ; an evil which, besides carrying in its train all the misfortunes that have hitherto afflicted the human race, seems, if not timely checked, to be pregnant with mischiefs that surpass all observation, and defy all remedy ; in short, an evil which threatens to produce the general and permanent infelicity of mankind, and to occasion the total loss of all the advantages resulting from a state of society.

It would be extremely inadequate to describe the evil alluded to, by the general and common term " The French Revolution."—The event of a Revolution does not unfrequently occur in the History of the World. But that of France has little in common with those which preceded it, except the name ; and we must resort to those circumstances which are peculiar to itself, and by which it is essentially distinguished from all others, to account for the unspeakable mischiefs it has already produced, as well as for those which it still portends.

HITHERTO a Revolution has operated no more than a change or alteration in the Government of  
a Coun-

a Country. Such change or alteration has indeed been generally accompanied with animosity, civil discord, and convulsion. But the contest over, these dreadful concomitants disappeared; Government was transferred to other hands, or varied in its form. The sense of mankind, however, invariably admitted the necessity of some efficient Government; and the very struggle itself recognized such necessity. But the distinguishing feature of the French Revolution has been an endeavour to subvert all legitimate authority. The fundamental principle of this remarkable event; is to absolve mankind from all ties of duty and allegiance to the established Government, whatever it may be, and in the room thereof to substitute the anarchy of popular controul. This principle has succeeded under the false guise and borrowed name of Civil Rights; which have been used as pretexts to inflame the passions of the multitude, to mislead their judgment, and to render them instrumental to the common ruin.

If the mischiefs which have resulted had been confined to France, they would afford a most striking and awful lesson to the rest of the world; suggesting that the greatest misfortune a people can suffer, is to be freed from the restraints of



Law and Government; restraints which are inseparable from an orderly state of society.

THE progressive horrors of the last four years, and the accumulated miseries which mark the present situation of that once flourishing country, must impress every feeling mind in a manner that language would in vain attempt to describe.

If merely the *political* interests of so many millions were abandoned to frenzy, and left at the mercy of every wild caprice and mad project of an inflamed, deluded, and inexperienced multitude (themselves the engines of artful miscreants), the calamity would be highly deserving of commiseration.—But France also exhibits an immense and populous country in every respect a prey to confusion and disorder—subject to no legitimate controul—exposed to all the outrages of ungovernable passion and insatiable malice—affording no personal security but what is found in the precarious resources of silence, concealment, or hypocrisy—under the dominion of terror, of violence, and crimes—where dissensions are composed only by blood, and slaughter alone gives predominance to faction—where the ties of society are all loosed, the feelings of nature and humanity



nity obliterated, every social duty and affection despised, the obligations of morality and religion disregarded, and Infidelity and Atheism publicly avowed and applauded—and where the national character of a once polished and liberal people is degraded far below that of savages.—Such are the consequences which have flowed from the principles adopted, and acted on in France; consequences which flow as naturally from such a source, as night succeeds to day, or as the effect proceeds from the cause.

BUT, besides the influence of sympathetic sensibility, the rest of Europe has abundant reason on its own account to interest itself in the situation of France. The disorders to which that country is a prey, are not only themselves of a contagious nature, but the French people, insensible of their own delirium, seem eager to spread the infection, and to render all mankind as miserable as themselves. Like the fallen Angels, they aspire to no other happiness than that of involving others in their own guilt and wretchedness. Torn and divided among themselves, destitute of all internal sources of union, they accord only in a wish to curse their neighbours, by communicating their own ungovernable spirit of licentiousness (most falsely termed

termed liberty), and by extending their wild and pernicious notions of absurd and unattainable equality. In such objects only can they agree; by such ties only can their discordant parties be united. They seem sensible, and with great reason, that it is only by extending the Reign of Anarchy abroad, that they can preserve its Empire at home; and that unless they can succeed in such an attempt, they must at length be compressed, and probably by a very painful process, into a state of order and cohesion. They are therefore indefatigable, beyond all example, in diffusing the poison of their principles; in propagating their horrid rights of man (from which order, humanity, and justice are totally excluded); and in prompting the seditious of every country to revolt and insurrection; and wherever they can, by such means, succeed in weakening the bands of society, they instantly improve the advantage by the sword, and, under the delusory name of Freedom, establish confusion by force of Arms. Considering their own country as the focus of disorder and anarchy, they think themselves entitled to make it the seat of universal dominion; pretending to erect the banner of Liberty, they try to subjugate other nations to their own yoke; and, notwithstanding the most pacific professions, their rage for conquest greatly exceeds all that ambitious or religious frenzy has ever excited.

THE

THE system pursued by these unprincipled madmen, with respect to other countries, bears a very close analogy to that which prevails among themselves at home. Having, in their domestic concerns, trampled upon all laws human and divine, and violated every function of honour, humanity, and religion, they equally disregard the obligation of those engagements which have been formed between different nations with a view to mutual harmony and reciprocal security. The laws of nations are no more respected by them, than those of municipal authority, or of moral obligation. They consider their own wild and ungovernable will as paramount to the most solemn treaties; and by a vague and fictitious reference to natural rights, they pretend not only to set aside the most positive stipulations, but also to absolve other nations from their authority. They even claim a right to direct the internal concerns of foreign countries, and to prescribe their form of Government. Thus do they invade the independence of other States, and arrogate to themselves the right of giving Law to the whole world.

It may here be allowed to pause a moment, to deplore the injury which the cause of real genuine Freedom has sustained from the horrid combination



tion of events which form the French Revolution. Such events tend not only to check the progress of Liberty, but also, by assuming its sacred name, to prejudice and disgrace it in the eyes of mankind.

At the commencement of that eventful period, France presented the fairest prospect of emerging from a state of despotism to that of glorious and salutary freedom. It possessed a Monarch who sought the happiness of his people, and who rejoiced in sacrificing thereto all the ancient Prerogatives of his Crown, which were incompatible with their real political welfare. But a violent and profligate faction (aided by the most wild and inflammatory principles, subversive of all Government, and industriously propagated by every channel of the press) defeated the hopeful prospect; and having broken down all the fences which could restrain the passions and the vicious propensities of mankind, led an inflamed, an insatuated, and a corrupted people from excess to excess, and from crime to crime, till they attained the very summit of enormity by imbruing their savage hands in the blood of their beneficent Sovereign; a Sovereign, whose misfortunes originated in his solicitude for his people's welfare; and whose piety and virtues will attract the admiration of the latest posterity.



It is not, perhaps, much to be wondered at, that the infamous perpetrators of such crimes should seek to facilitate the success of their nefarious projects, by pretending to be engaged in the cause of Freedom; and by representing every endeavour to check their pernicious progress (whether it be by opposing the success of their arms, or the spread of their principles), as an effort of despotism to crush the liberties of mankind. But for any one in this country to hold such language, is the greatest insult that can be offered to a free and enlightened nation.

We know the value of liberty, and we properly detest every species of arbitrary power; but we remember the slow and arduous progress by which our civil rights were established on a secure and permanent basis; and we are aware that anarchy is much more hostile to genuine freedom, and much further removed from it, than despotism itself. The latter restrains mankind from becoming free; the former renders them unworthy and unfit to be so: the one checks, indeed, the progress of liberty; the other corrupts and destroys its essence. The passage from Despotism to Liberty is slow, gradual, and difficult;—it is however eventually certain, unless licentiousness should intervene with its train of evils, infinitely worse than all

which despots can produce: but from anarchy to sound and salutary freedom there is no passage, but through the gloomy and heart-chilling paths of despotic rule. For when mankind are once loosed from the restraints of government, of law, and of order, they unavoidably become so wild, ungovernable, and vitiated, that nothing but the strong iron hand of Arbitrary Power can bring them into any kind of regular subjection, or restore their capacity for the enjoyment of orderly freedom.

Thus, upon a comparative view of the effects of despotism and anarchy, it will appear, that the former checks the lovely flower of Freedom from opening and prevents it from expanding its folds, and charming the world with its beauty and fragrance: still, however, in the maturity of mind, and under the cheering and invigorating influence of taste and science, that flower will gradually burst its fragile bounds, no longer capable of restraining its progress, but under which, though long confined, it had been sheltered in its feeble state from the chilling blast and the blighting mildew: but the wild hand of Anarchy tears at once the bud from the stem, and roughly throws it on the ground to wither and to perish; and another season must revolve, before all-bounteous nature can repair the wanton ravage.

THE

THE accession of Territory already made by France, should itself be sufficient to rouse every other European Power to the most vigorous exertions, in order to check the progress of such over-weening ambition, and to restore that general balance of power which has been thus disturbed, and which long experience has shewn to be necessary to the harmony and tranquillity of this quarter of the globe. For not to mention the early invasion of Avignon and the Comtat, and the usurpation of the rights of the German Princes in Alsace, already does Savoy form a part of the French territories.—The Imperial Towns of Spire, Worms, Mentz, and Frankfort, and the Bishopric of Liege have been seized by French troops.—The hitherto free and independent Republic of Geneva has been subjected by superior force to the Dominion of France;—and the extensive and fertile Provinces known by the description of the Austrian Netherlands, after being infected by French principles, have been over-run by French armies: and though the unfortunate inhabitants have found, by experience, that Gallic Liberty is the most degrading servitude, they are destitute of all means of freeing themselves from the miserable subjection into which they have been deluded and forced; and the ab-



solate Sovereignty of these Provinces is at present vested in their rapacious Conquerors.

BUT the principles upon which France professes to wage war render her ambition and her conquests peculiarly alarming to the security, the welfare, and the independence of the rest of Europe; for instead of admitting the necessity of any national difference as a ground for war, she assumes the hitherto-unheard-of right of invading and subduing other countries, without any existing cause of quarrel or dissension. By the remarkable Decree of the 19th of November 1792, the Convention, disclaiming all those ties by which Nations have hitherto held themselves bound to respect the tranquillity and independence of each other, announces to the World that France will consider as a sufficient reason for war, the pretext of giving liberty to other Nations;—a pretext the most vague, indefinite, and flimsy, that was ever urged as an occasion for hostilities;—a pretext which, while it is desultory in principle, is of so extensive a latitude, that no Country in any possible situation, or by any possible precaution, can guard against its application.

It is impossible to view such a Decree otherwise than as a general declaration of war—a Declaration of the most insolent, perfidious, and malignant



malignant kind. For while France thereby avows, in unequivocal language, that she does not consider herself bound to observe any measures with the Governments of other Countries, she asserts a right to make war with them in a case of which she not only makes herself the sole Judge, but which upon her own principles she has prejudged to exist in every part of Europe. This Decree is also evidently intended to accelerate its own execution by exciting every other people to disaffection and revolt, and by holding out an invitation to the seditious and disaffected of every Country to exert themselves against the established Government; in short, by unfolding the principles on which France is now carrying on war with other Countries, this Decree interests all the rest of Europe against her success in that war; as such success would only enable her to carry her menace into general effect.

THE present licentious, disorderly, and savage state of France, while it stamps a kind of originality upon the idea that such a Country in such a situation should pretend to confer liberty upon other Nations, explains at the same time what species of liberty it is which is meant to be thus generously bestowed. Not that liberty which is founded upon law and favourable to order—not that liberty which is allied to security and productive of

of confidence and harmony—alas ! France has no such liberty to confer.—It is the reverse thereof that she has established at home, and that she seeks to communicate abroad ; a turbulent, unbridled, ferocious, and sanguinary liberty ; produced by the removal of every wholesome restraint, and accompanied by the privilege of committing the most atrocious crimes with impunity.

It is plain therefore, that the famous, or rather the infamous and incendiary Decree of the 19th of November 1792, called the Decree of *Fraternity*, when translated into accurate language, and explained by the principles and conduct of France, is neither more nor less than an offer of fraternity and assistance to the rebellious of every Country in Europe, and an assurance that whenever they can make themselves tolerably strong, they shall be openly aided to bring their Country into the same state of distraction and uproar as France herself exhibits to the world. And so sanguine was the Convention of the speedy effect of this plan of universal insurrection, that the Decree in question proceeded to charge the Executive Council to give the Generals the necessary orders to assist such nations and to defend such citizens as had been or might be prosecuted in the cause of liberty : while, to prevent any doubt of the unlimited ex-

tent

tent of the Decree, an amendment proposed by some Member, that it should be applicable only to those people on whose territory the Armies of the Republic had already entered, was instantly rejected; and it was ordered to be translated into all languages.

THERE is abundant reason to conclude, that the Convention was encouraged the sooner to pass this Decree by the rash confidence it reposed in those unworthy Members of the British name who represented, according to their traitorous wishes, though in direct contradiction to the fact, that England was ripe for revolt, and eager to adopt the principles and to follow the example of France.—For in less than two months afterwards, when the British People, with a zeal, a fervor, and an unanimity, unparalleled in the history of the world, had testified their ardent and inviolable attachment to their King and Constitution (proving thereby that they both understood and deserved the privileges by which they are so eminently distinguished)—and when the British Government, strong and formidable in the fidelity and affection of the people, as well as in the unprecedented prosperity and unrivalled resources of the Country, spoke the firm, manly, and reasonable language of preparation to curb the insolence, to chastise the perfidy, and to check the conquests



conquests of France, and to vindicate the dignity and independence of Great Britain and her allies: then did the French Minister think it prudent to crouch to the British Lion, and endeavoured to soften the Decree by an explanation, which, however unsatisfactory and inadmissible, was so forced and unnatural, that it never had occurred and never could occur to any one as the real and original meaning of the Decree itself.

By this explanation the Minister denies the intent of the Decree to be as England had felt and understood it, viz. *to encourage and favour the seditions of all Nations*; and he pretends to confine its operation to “the sole case in which the general will of a Nation clearly and unequivocally expressed should call the French Nation to its assistance and fraternity.” A great variety of important observations present themselves upon the subject of this explanation. In the first place, the explanation is not only *not warranted* by the Decree, but it is such as the Decree is by no means capable of bearing. The Decree itself is an offer in terms “of fraternity and assistance to all people who wish to recover their liberty;” and being ordered *to be translated and printed into all languages*, it is evidently an invitation to all people to apply to France for such assistance.—The explanation



explanation artfully supposes the interference of France to be engaged only when spontaneously applied for by another people; a difference no less than that which exists between the bravo who by a promise of assistance invites and encourages others to quarrel and to fight, intending in a favourable moment to take advantage of the skirmish—and the generous stranger who flies at the call of distress, and rescues the defenceless victim from destruction.

The explanation, seeking also to rebut the charge of intending to excite and foster sedition, which it defines to be “the movement of a small number against the nation at large,” declares that the assistance of France is promised only to a whole people and not to a part.—But how does this construction accord with a fundamental principle adopted in France, that *for a people to be free it is sufficient that they will it*; according to which principle the explanation would reduce the Decree to a mere promise of assistance, when it cannot be wanted, and an offer of freedom to a people who shall be already in complete possession of it. Can a doubt however exist, that it was *effectual* assistance which was meant to be bestowed? To doubt that, would be to affront the benevolent intentions of the Convention. Besides, the Decree, by which France is to furnish assistance.—The explanation

Decree, so far from containing any expressions tending to restrict its application to the case mentioned in the explanation, promises in the most general terms assistance to all people who shall wish to recover their liberty, *qui voudront recouvrer leur liberté*; which is precisely the kind of language that is most calculated to cherish and expand the latent seeds of discontent and sedition in every Country, but not at all applicable to the case of that unanimous expression of the general will, which in Society must ever be irresistible, and which therefore can stand in no need of assistance.—That the Decree in question is incompatible with the explanation attempted to be given, will further appear from the direction it contains to the Executive Power, to send the necessary orders to the Generals to carry it into prompt execution, by giving assistance to such people and to defend *those citizens* who have suffered or who may suffer in the cause of liberty. Can such orders, particularly in the terms in which they are here directed to be given, be made to accord with the restriction of the Decree to the case where a *whole people* may apply for the assistance of France?—Are the Generals to be judges of the question, whether the application proceeds from a whole people or a part? or is there the least hint or suggestion to them, that any such enquiry is to be made? No, they

Decree, to far from containing any expressions, they are instantly armed with authority, at their own discretion, to defend, not merely a people, but "those Citizens" (i. e. any part of a people) "who HAVE SUFFERED or may suffer in the cause of liberty."

THE impossibility of making the explanation accord with the Decree, affords an adequate presumption that the former was insincere; but divers concomitant circumstances prove to demonstration, not only the insincerity of the explanation, but also that it was meant to lull this Country into a state of deceitful confidence, with a view, doubtless, of involving us by surprise in the general ruin.

ADMITTING however, by way of argument, that the Decree was in itself capable of the construction put upon it by the French Minister in his official Note of the 7th of January 1793, still the dignity, the welfare, and the independence of this Country rendered it impossible to accept such an Explanation; which, when stripped of its subtlety, and viewed in its true light, is equally objectionable with the Decree itself; for it still maintains the right of France to interfere in the internal affairs of other Countries; and though it pretends to limit the exercise of that right to a particular



case, yet as the existence of that case is referred only to the judgment of France, such a limitation amounts to nothing, and the claim stands absolute and unrestricted. Indeed a claim of that nature cannot be recognized in any shape or under any pretence. If in *any* respect, but particularly in a matter of such concern to a people as the form or existence of its Government, one Country could claim a title, under whatever colour, to dictate to other Nations, the latter would lose not only their freedom and independence as States, but also their entire security for their internal liberties. For it is essential to a free and independent State to be subject to no foreign controul or influence whatever, in the regulation of its domestic affairs; and if by the introduction of a foreign force the Government of a Country were to be changed or modelled, by what means could the people free themselves from the dominion necessarily resulting from such interference? Would it be prudent to rely on the generosity, and disinterestedness of the Power at whose mercy they lay to abandon all views of ambition and avarice, and to relinquish the opportunity for aggrandizement which had been thus acquired? Would the pretence of affording assistance in recovering their liberty, be a sufficient security that no advantage should be taken of the dependent situation to which they had been by

that



that very assistance reduced? No, they would soon discover that their generous friends, who were ready enough to liberate them from their own Government, would be as ready to substitute in its place the intolerable dominion of a foreign yoke. Pretences as plausible and specious as that on which interference was first made, would easily be found for its continuance; and the unfortunate people, after the recent example of the Belgians, would realize the fable of the sheep, which exchanged their protecting dogs for devouring wolves.

THE claim, therefore, asserted by France, even in her Explanations, is daring and presumptuous in the extreme, and must be repelled by every State that has any regard for its political independence, or its domestic freedom and security. If the Decree of the 10th of November was an universal Declaration of War, the Explanation of that Decree is an assertion of Universal Sovereignty. So far is the pretence on which this claim is founded from affording any qualification, it is, perhaps, the most dangerous that could have been advanced. If France, as the general dispenser of liberty, were authorised to say to other Governments, "You are tyrannical" and must be demolished," nothing more would be necessary to make her the mistress—the tyrant of the world. Such a pretence could be easily borrowed

THE extreme jealousy which France has borrowed on all occasions; and being supported by force, no place would be found unsuitable, no time unfit, for its application. The pretended restriction of it to the case of solicitation for assistance from a whole people, is the most obvious subterfuge that was ever invented; for France reserves to herself the sole right of deciding, whether the solicitation comes from a whole people, or a part: a question itself of the most ambiguous nature: and the attention which she has paid to the Addresses of seditious Societies here, some of which Societies were not even known to exist till they were brought into notice by the Convention, proves to demonstration, that she would always consider those turbulent and disaffected persons who are to be found even in the best-regulated States, (however few and insignificant they might be) as expressing the general voice. The new-constructed Gallic optics are contrived to magnify the disaffected part of a State into the whole. Indeed, the claim of thinking and speaking for the community at large is invariably urged by persons of that description; and the rhetorical figure which makes a part stand for the whole, is no where in such general use as among the partizans of Sedition.

THE

THE extreme jealousy which France has shewn with respect to any interference of other nations in her own concerns (although in her situation it would have been the greatest blessing to have obtained by any means a settled and regular Government) furnishes the most pointed explanation of her views in seeking to establish a case in which she shall at pleasure interfere in the domestic interests of other States. By thus denying to them the same measure which she so strenuously claims for herself, she fully proves the injustice as well as the ambition by which she is actuated. It is impossible not to notice the contrast to such conduct which has been exhibited by Great Britain, who, during the whole Revolution, has observed a strict neutrality, a generous and magnanimous forbearance, with regard to France, neither insulting the misfortunes, intermeddling in the affairs, nor taking advantage of the distresses of that distracted country;—a conduct the more noble, as it succeeded the injuries we had recently received from her in the American dispute. As, however, we returned good for evil, so we have in our turn been recompensed by the blackest perfidy and the most atrocious and injurious attempts to destroy our internal quiet; and at length, because we were not a people to sacrifice our dignity and to forego our means of security, we are driven into a war;  
of



of which war, however, innumerable memorials of British spirit, valour, and conduct, prognosticate the most happy and honourable termination.

It has been thought essential to discuss rather fully the subject of the Decree of Fraternity, because that Decree seems to afford the touchstone of explanation as to the conduct and views of France with respect to other countries.

A great variety of facts have concurred to shew, that the real intent of this Decree corresponded closely with that import which it obviously bears, and which England and indeed all Europe had uniformly ascribed to it. Nor can it be considered in any other light than as aggression against the tranquillity, the honour, the rights, and the independence, of every other State. By assuming the specious though shadowy pretext of granting assistance to nations in recovering their liberty, it became infinitely more dangerous and hostile than an avowed intention of subjecting all other countries to the dominion of France could have been; for such was the artful and insidious nature of that pretext, that it was calculated to create the very case to which it referred; and by affording a covering, it tended to promote the success of that ambition which by an open display would have been entirely frustrated. Under the mask of religion the arms

of



of Mahomet established the empire of the Saracens—and under the mask of liberty the French seek to establish the infinitely more formidable empire of Anarchy. But surely at the close of the eighteenth century mankind are much too wise to be deluded into a belief that either true Religion or true Liberty can be propagated by force of arms.

If the Convention had stopped here, it would have done enough to excite the indignation and to rouse the vengeance of all Europe. But fearful, as it should seem, of not having been sufficiently explicit in its projects of universal confusion, by another Decree, dated the 15th of December 1792, it reduces the general plan promulgated by the Decree of Fraternity into a regular system, and furnishes the detail of that process by which other States are to be broken up and decomposed, and their Government, Institutions, Laws, Usages, and Constituted Authorities, entirely abolished.

By the Decree of Fraternity the general right of invasion was fully asserted, and the artful pretence of giving liberty was assumed as an universal passport for the French Arms. By the Decree of the 15th of December the Convention lay down the plan by which the operation of bestowing

E

Liberty

Liberty is to be performed. And so destructive an operation, both in its progress and its tendency, was never before devised by the malice and tyranny of man. A few passages of this Decree will best speak for themselves.

*“ National Convention, December 15, 1792.*

“ THE National Convention, after having heard  
 “ the report of the united Finance, Military, and  
 “ Diplomatic Committees, faithful to the principles of the Sovereignty of the People, *which will*  
 “ *not permit them to acknowledge any of the institutions militating against it* and willing to fix the  
 “ regulations to be observed by the Generals of  
 “ the Armies of the Republic in those countries  
 “ to which they may carry their arms, decree :

“ ARTICLE I.—IN those countries which are or  
 “ shall be occupied by the Armies of the French  
 “ Republic, the Generals shall immediately proclaim, in the name of the French Nation, the  
 “ abolition of all existing imposts or contributions;  
 “ of tithes ; of all feudal and manorial rights, fixed  
 “ or casual ; of all real or personal services ; of  
 “ the exclusive right of hunting and fishing ; of  
 “ state labour : of the Nobility ; and generally of  
 “ all

“all privileges:—they shall declare to the People, that they bring them peace, succours, liberty and equality.” The connection in which these last terms are used serves as a glossary to explain their meaning in the new French Vocabulary, and informs mankind that the peace, succours, liberty, and equality, in a Democratical sense, import hostility, oppression, slavery, and insubordination.

“ARTICLE II.—THEY shall proclaim the Sovereignty of the People, and THE SUPPRESSION OF ALL EXISTING AUTHORITIES; they shall then convoke the people in Primary Assemblies to create and organize a Provisionary Administration; they shall cause the present Decree, and the Proclamation hereto annexed, to be published and affixed in the language or dialect of the country, and TO BE EXECUTED without delay in every District.

“ARTICLE III.—All the Agents and Officers of the former Government, Military or Civil, as well as the individuals lately reputed Noble, and the Members of any Corporation lately privileged, shall, for the first election only, be inadmissible to any place in the Provisional Administration or Judicial Power.



“ARTICLE IV.—THE Generals shall forthwith place under the protection and safeguard of THE FRENCH REPUBLIC, all property, moveable or immoveable, belonging to the Prince, to his voluntary abettors, adherents, or attendants; to the Bodies and Communities, both Civil and Religious; they shall cause to be drawn up, without delay, an exact state thereof, which they shall transmit to the Executive Council; and they shall take every measure in their power to cause such property to be respected.”

THIS may be called, with great precision, the article providing for plunder and pillage.

THEN follow a variety of clauses, particularizing further *minutiae* of this audacious plan of infringement on the independence and tranquillity of all Nations. But the last Article furnishes the clue to the whole.

“ARTICLE XI.—THE French Nation declare, that IT WILL TREAT AS ENEMIES THE PEOPLE WHO, REFUSING OR RENOUNCING LIBERTY AND EQUALITY, ARE DESIROUS OF PRESERVING THEIR PRINCE AND PRIVILEGED CASTS, OR OF ENTERING INTO AN ACCOMMODATION WITH THEM. The Nation promises and engages not

“to



"to lay down its arms until the Sovereignty and  
 "Liberty of the People on whose territories the  
 "French Armies shall have entered shall be estab-  
 "lished, and not to consent to any arrangement  
 "or treaty with the Princes and privileged per-  
 "sons so dispossessed, with whom the Republic  
 "is at war." While by this Decree the Conven-  
 tion erect themselves into Legislators for the whole  
 human race, we should in vain search the Annals  
 of the World for an Edict of such rapacious,  
 ruinous and insulting Despotism.

HITHERTO the conduct of France has been  
 chiefly considered as it affected the common  
 welfare and security of all Nations. In this  
 light Great Britain was equally interested in that  
 conduct with other States, and came alike within  
 the scope of French Principles and French Decrees.  
 It would indeed be absurd to suppose that  
 an exception was intended in favour of this  
 country; though, supposing the best possible  
 dispositions to have existed in our behalf, it  
 surely would not be very congenial to the feelings  
 of an Englishman to depend on the dispositions  
 of our natural enemies, particularly after they  
 should have over-run all Europe, and taken the  
 balance into their own hands. But the fact, that  
 England was distinctly, as well as generally,  
 involved in the revolutionary plans of France,

does

does not rest on presumption. The numerous efforts that have been made by our Gallic neighbours to excite the British people to insurrection, by desperate Emissaries sent for that obvious purpose—by the consignment to our ports of incendiary books (as if our own press had not been adequate to the common purposes of sedition—and by the application of pecuniary incentives to revolt—afford convincing proofs that we were not neglected, nor meant to be deprived of our share of French Fraternity. Left, however, such endeavours should be ascribed to the unauthorised zeal of Propagandists, the open, unreserved, and recorded communication which has subsisted between the Convention and the agents of English sedition, completely rescues that *august* body from the charge of inattention to our separate interests. The cordial reception accorded by them to Addresses delivered at their BAR, from various British Societies formed for the obvious purpose of subverting the Constitution by the fraternal assistance of France, and the immediate and flattering responses given thereto, are facts of such stubborn and unequivocal nature as to defy all misconstruction, and to render all retraction impossible. It is due to the reader to present him with some extracts from this daring and perfidious correspondence; which, while it demonstrates that the views of France extended

extended to the confusion and ruin of this country, will evince that the explanations which have been given to us by the Executive Council were founded in insincerity, and that they aimed only at delusion.

IN the month of November 1792 divers Addresses from English and Irish subjects were presented to the Convention. The spirit and object of these Addresses will sufficiently appear from the statement of a few extracts. In one dated from NEWINGTON, 31st of October 1792, and read in the Convention the 10th of November, are found the following passages :

“ ILLUSTRIOUS Senators, dear friends, enlightened Legislators, we can inform you at this day, and with the truest satisfaction, that the impious enmity so long and malignantly kept up in the hearts of a generous people towards the French Nation, by the manœuvres and intrigues of a perfidious Court, exists no more, but in the hearts of the perverse, who profit by abuses.

“ It is with the warmest and most profound sensibility that we behold the success of your arms in your undertaking to deliver from slavery and despotism the brave Nations which  
“ border



"border your Frontiers: How holy is the  
 "humanity which prompts you to break their  
 "chains."

THE REVOLUTION SOCIETY in London, in an  
 Address dated the 5th of November 1792, after  
 applauding in theory the principle that "all  
 "nations have a right to give themselves such a  
 "form of Government as their own wisdom  
 "may suggest," very explicitly unfold their  
 notion of the practical application of that prin-  
 ciple in the following choice sentence:

"AND we feel an agreeable sensation in behold-  
 "ing that this RIGHT OF INSURRECTION has been  
 "successfully exercised in so large a country as  
 "that of the French Republic."

THIS accords perfectly with the memorable  
 expression of one of the original promoters of the  
 misfortunes of France, Monsieur de la Fayette,  
 that "Insurrection is the most sacred of du-  
 "ties."

AN Address to the Convention from the Vo-  
 LUNTEERS OF BELFAST, dated the 6th of No-  
 vember, is distinguished by this devout and be-  
 nevolent prayer:

For

"For the glory of humanity, may your Declaration of Rights, be everywhere put in practice."

BUT the hopes and the projects of English sedition were displayed still more fully and boldly in the following Address read in the Convention November 7, 1792, and stiled "An Address from several Patriotic Societies in England," than which Address nothing could be better calculated to ascertain whether France really meant to give encouragement to the seditious of other countries, or merely, according to the explanation afterwards given, to listen to "the solicitations of a whole people" for assistance in recovering their liberty. The following passages deserve particular notice:

"WHILST foreign plunderers ravage your territories, *an oppressed part of mankind*, forgetting their own evils, are sensible only of yours, and beholding the present events with a disturbed eye, address their most fervent prayers to the God of the Universe, that he may be favourable to your cause, *with which their's is so intimately connected.*"

"DEGRADED by an oppressive system of inquiry, the insensible but continual encroach-

"ments of which quickly deprived this nation  
 "of its boasted liberty, and reduced it almost to  
 "that abject state of slavery, from which you  
 "have so gloriously emancipated yourselves;  
 "five thousand English citizens, fired with in-  
 "dignation, have the courage to step forward to  
 "rescue their country from that opprobrium  
 "which has been thrown upon it by the base  
 "conduct of those who are invested with power."

"FRENCHMEN ! our numbers will appear very  
 "small, when compared with the rest of the na-  
 "tion; but *know that it increases every day*; and  
 "if the terrible and continually elevated arm of  
 "authority overawes the timid; if falsehoods,  
 "every moment dispersed with so much industry,  
 "mislead the credulous; and if the public inti-  
 "macy of the Court with Frenchmen, avowed  
 "traitors to their country, hurry away the am-  
 "bitious and unthinking, we can with confidence  
 "assure you, Freeman and Friends, that know-  
 "ledge makes a rapid progress among us."

"ENDEAVOURING to discover our cruel ene-  
 "mies, we have found them in the partisans of  
 "that destructive aristocracy by which our bo-  
 "som is torn; an aristocracy which has hitherto  
 "been



"been the bane of all the countries of the earth.

"You have acted wisely in banishing it from  
"France."

"We see also, without concern, that the Elec-  
"tor of Hanover unites his troops to those of  
"traitors and robbers; but the King of England  
"will do well to remember, that England is not  
"Hanover: SHOULD HE FORGET THIS, WE WILL  
"NOT FORGET IT."

THE reception given to the above Addresses puts it beyond all doubt, that the Convention might be justly "charged with the design of  
"favouring the seditious of Great Britain, and  
"of making the cause of a few private indi-  
"viduals that of the French nation," notwith-  
standing the positive denial of such design in the explanation given by Mons. LE BRUN to the Decree of the 19th of November. The Ad-  
dresses were ordered to be printed, and copies of the last (as being undoubtedly the most explicit) to be sent to the armies and to all the Departments; and the President of the Convention read an an-  
swer, of which one sentence is a key to the whole:  
—"The sentiments of 5000 Britons devoted  
"openly to the cause of mankind, exist without

"doubt in the hearts of all the freemen in England."

A comment upon this expression would be an insult to the understanding of the reader.

To do justice, however, to the extensive and generous views of the Convention, which have been so much narrow'd and misrepresented by Mons. LE BRUN, it will be still necessary to see at their Bar the worthy English Citizens JOHN FROST and JOEL BARLOW, and to attend to the following Address pronounced by one of this *par nobile fratrum* on the 28th of November 1792.

"CITIZENS of France, we are deputed by a Patriotic Society in London, called "The Society for Constitutional Information," to congratulate you in its name upon the triumphs of Liberty.

"Before the epocha of your Revolution, this Society employed itself but too long upon this important object with little hope of success.

"Judge from thence of the transports of its gratitude, when, thanks to the wonderful efforts

"of the French Nation, it has beheld the Empire

"of Reason extend and strengthen itself; and

"affure to virtuous men, by securing the happiness of their fellow creatures, a recompence to

"their future labours. Innumerable Societies, of

"the same sort, are forming themselves at this mo-

"ment

"ment in every part of England. The minds of  
 "all receive from this circumstance a general im-  
 "pression, which leads them to fathom the abuses  
 "of Government, and to seek the means of reme-  
 "dying them.—Means as simple as the abuses are  
 "intricate. After the example given by France,  
 "Revolutions will become easy: Reason is about to  
 "make a rapid progress, and it would not be ex-  
 "traordinary if, in a much less space of time than  
 "can be imagined, the French should send Addresses  
 "of congratulation to a National Convention of  
 "England \*.

"We are also instructed to acquaint the Con-  
 "vention that the Society, which we represent  
 "has sent 1000 pair of shoes to be presented as a  
 "patriotic gift to the Soldiers of Liberty—these  
 "shoes are at Calais. The same Society will send

\* Great pains are now taking to deny the existence of sedi-  
 tious practices in this country at the period in question. But  
 can better evidence be required to that point, than the Decla-  
 rations of those very persons who were obviously planning, in  
 concert with France, the subversion of our Constitution? who  
 publicly and honestly avowed, that innumerable Societies were  
 forming themselves at that very moment upon the same principle  
 in every part of England; and who were confident of the speedy  
 approach of the time when the French should send addresses to a  
 National Convention of England. After such testimony, it must  
 require a considerable degree of confidence to assert, that the  
 embodying of the militia, and the assembling of Parliament  
 were measures of frivolous alarm, or of sinister design, rather  
 than precautions of sound policy and obvious prudence.



" 1000 pair a-week for the six next weeks, for  
" the same purpose."

THIS Address from two *English Citizens*, was but  
the precursor of another Address, which it seems  
those envoys were deputed to present to the  
Convention from an English Society styling itself  
(probably by way of *antithesis*) the " Society for  
" CONSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION in London."  
The latter Address, which was read by the Secre-  
tary, contained the following striking passages :

" REPRESENTATIVES of a Sovereign People,  
" and Benefactors of Mankind ! We rejoice that  
" the French Revolution has arrived at that de-  
" gree of perfection which will permit us to ad-  
" dress you by these titles ; they are the only ones  
" that can accord with the character of true Le-  
" gislators.

" EVERY successive epocha in your political re-  
" generation has EACH added something to the  
" triumph of Liberty ; and the glorious victory  
" of the 10th of August has finally prepared the  
" way for a Constitution which, enlightened as  
" you are, we trust will be established on the  
" basis of Nature and Reason."

" THE events of every day are proving, that  
" you have gained the opinion of all the nations

" placed

“ placed near you on the Continent ; that a ma-  
 “ jority of each of those nations is really your  
 “ friends ; that their apparent enmity is only a  
 “ temporary consequence of the violence exercised  
 “ against them by their Governments ; and that  
 “ they only wait to be delivered by your arms  
 “ from the necessity of fighting against you.”

“ OUR Government has all the power, and per-  
 “ haps the inclination, to employ hireling pens  
 “ to contradict us ; but we believe, in the sincer-  
 “ ity of our hearts, that we now speak the senti-  
 “ ments of a majority of the English Nation.”

“ THE sparks of liberty preserved in England  
 “ for several ages, like the lights of Aurora Bo-  
 “ realis, served only to discover to the rest of  
 “ Europe the darkness which covered it. A  
 “ stronger light, image of the real Aurora, shone  
 “ forth from the bosom of the American Republic,  
 “ but its distance prevented it from enlightening  
 “ your hemisphere. It was necessary that the  
 “ French Revolution, beaming forth in the full  
 “ fervour of a meridian sun, should suddenly dis-  
 “ play in the midst of Europe the practical result  
 “ of the principles which philosophy had sown in  
 “ the shade of meditation, and which experience  
 “ every where confirms.”

“ OTHER.

" OTHER nations will soon follow your steps in  
 " this career of improvement, and rising from  
 " their lethargy, will arm themselves for the pur-  
 " pose of claiming the Rights of Man, with that  
 " all powerful voice which Man cannot resist."

So far from there being any thing either in the  
 Speech or the Address above cited at all repugnant  
 to the *anti-seditious* views of the Convention, both  
 were honoured with long and general applause.  
 — The President, animated by congenial feelings,  
 made a most encouraging reply, wherein he thus  
 in part addressed himself to the worthy Represen-  
 tatives of the CONSTITUTIONAL SOCIETY:

" SPIRITED Children of a nation which has  
 " been celebrated through the two hemispheres,  
 " and which has afforded illustrious examples to  
 " the universe, you offer us more than your wishes,  
 " since the fate of our warriors has been thought  
 " deserving of your anxiety. — Those who now de-  
 " fend our liberty will one day become the de-  
 " fenders of yours. You were already entitled  
 " to our esteem, you are now entitled to our grati-  
 " tude; and Freemen will never forget what they  
 " owe to the English Nation.

" THE



“THE shades of Hampden and of Sydney  
 “hover over your heads, AND THE MOMENT,  
 “WITHOUT DOUBT, APPROACHES, IN WHICH  
 “THE FRENCH WILL BRING CONGRATULATIONS  
 “TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF GREAT  
 “BRITAIN.

“GENEROUS Republicans, your appearance  
 “among us prepares a subject for history. That  
 “day will be noticed, in which Citizens belong-  
 “ing to a nation long the rival of France, ap-  
 “peared in the midst of the Assembly of the  
 “Representatives of the French People, in the  
 “name of a crowd of their fellow-countrymen.”

To conclude this embassy in the most respect-  
 ful manner, the Deputies from the Constitu-  
 tional Society were admitted to the honour  
 of a Sitting, amidst unbounded applause.  
 The President of the National Convention was  
 directed to write a letter of thanks to those ge-  
 neralous Islanders, for the patriotic gifts which  
 they had just offered to the Armies of the Repub-  
 lic. The Speech, the Address, and the Answer of  
 the President, were ordered to be printed and sent  
 to the Eighty-three Departments, and to be tran-  
 slated into all languages; and minutes of the  
 proceedings were to be delivered to the Deputies,

and the patriotic gift to be accepted, and transmitted to the Minister at War.

AFTER so much fraternal communication across the Channel, it was to be expected that those Englishmen whose residence at Paris afforded them an opportunity of being properly initiated into the bloody rites of French Liberty, should seize the occasion of expressing their gratitude as well as their approbation. Accordingly, on the 28th of November, a Deputation from the English and Irish at Paris appeared at the bar, and as soon as loud and long reiterated plaudits would permit, the Spokesman addressed the August Senate in a speech of which the following is a part :

“ CITIZEN Legislators, the British and Irish  
 “ Citizens actually at Paris, constantly animated  
 “ by those principles which have given birth  
 “ and success to the French Revolution, assembled themselves last Sunday, for the purpose  
 “ of celebrating the success of your arms ; and  
 “ they have determined to present to you  
 “ their congratulations upon events which afford  
 “ so favourable an omen to those Nations who  
 “ are desirous of becoming free.

“ THE

“ THE disgraceful memory of those pretended  
 “ Governments, the offspring of the combined  
 “ fraud of Priests and Tyrants, will in a short  
 “ time alone remain.

“ OUR wishes, Citizen Legislators, render us  
 “ impatient to behold the happy moment of this  
 “ great change, in the hope that on its arrival we  
 “ shall see an intimate union formed between the  
 “ French Republic, and the English, Irish, and  
 “ Scotch Nations ; nor are we alone animated by  
 “ these sentiments : we doubt that they would  
 “ be equally conspicuous in the great majority of  
 “ our fellow-countrymen, if the public opinion  
 “ were to be consulted there, as it ought, in  
 “ A NATIONAL CONVENTION.

“ As for us who now reside at Paris, we gladly  
 “ take this opportunity to declare, that during  
 “ the whole course of the Revolution, and not-  
 “ withstanding the abrupt departure of our Am-  
 “ bassador, or rather the Ambassador of the  
 “ Court of London, we have constantly experi-  
 “ enced the utmost cordiality and openness, and  
 “ the most sincere friendship on the part of the  
 “ French Nation.”

THE President's reply contained the following  
 nervous and significant passage :



" PRINCIPLES are waging War against Tyranny,  
 " which will fall under the blows of Philosophy.  
 " Royalty in Europe is either destroyed, or on  
 " the point of perishing on the ruins of feoda-  
 " lity; and the Declaration of Rights placed by the  
 " side of Thrones, is a devouring fire which will  
 " consume them (*applauses*). Worthy Republi-  
 " cans, congratulate yourselves on thinking that  
 " the festival which you have made in honour  
 " of the French Revolution is the prelude to  
 " the festival of Nations. The Convention  
 " offers you the Honours of the Sitting."

THE Deputation crossed the Hall in the midst  
 of applauses.

IT is fair to conclude, that the English and Irish  
 from whom the last mentioned Address pro-  
 ceeded, propose, as soon as their foreign educa-  
 tion shall be finished, to return home and prac-  
 tise the lessons they learned on the 10th of August,  
 and the 2d and 3d of September 1792, and the  
 other memorable days which may ornament the  
 Calendar of the French Republic.

IT merits particular notice, that, among the  
 agents employed to carry on the seditious nego-  
 ciation between the disaffected English and the  
 Convention,

Convention, appears no less a person than Mr. LE BRUN himself—that Minister for Foreign Affairs who afterwards declared officially, in explanation of the Decree of the 19th of November, that it was foreign to the views of France, and inconsistent with the Decree of the 19th of November, to give encouragement to the seditious of other Countries, or to make the cause of a few private individuals that of the French Nation. The following extract from a letter of the above Minister, read in the Convention on the 29th of November, deserves to be produced in evidence, as well upon the question of his own sincerity in his subsequent communication with the British Government, as in further proof of the disposition of France to encourage and excite a spirit of insurrection in this country.

“ It is pleasant for me to add, that this devotion to the cause of the French Republic becomes general among the English People. The Addresses which I have been directed to transmit to the National Convention are a striking proof of it. Even yesterday I received (from a Society that consecrates its time to the establishing the Empire of Liberty and Equality, and would place its happiness in being able to contribute to the Union of two Nations which have been too long enemies) a Resolution taken  
“ in

" in its sitting of the 20th of this month, of which  
" the following is the translation."

THEN follows the Resolution above referred to,  
which LE BRUN so faithfully, so speedily, and so  
cordially transmitted to the Convention :

" THE Society having been informed that Mr.  
" Lyndsay is dispatched to Paris without any  
" Diplomatic Character which announces that  
" the English Ministry acknowledges the French  
" Republic ;

" RESOLVED unanimously, that this Society de-  
" votes to the contempt, the hatred, and the in-  
" dignation of the true Friends of Liberty, the  
" Agents of a corrupt Administration, who have  
" the audacity to depute to the Ministers of a  
" Free People a person named Lyndsay, with a  
" threatening, insulting message, with the view of  
" obtaining conditions which would dishonour  
" the Majesty of the French People, and make  
" it abandon the cause of those people who are  
" ambitious of receiving from it the gift of Li-  
" berty.

" RESOLVED, that the President of the Society  
" do invite all the Friends of Equality, all the  
" Corresponding Societies in France, to employ  
" their



" their zeal, their efforts, their solicitations with  
 " the Executive Council, and in particular with  
 " the Citizen Minister for Foreign Affairs, that  
 " they will not receive or acknowledge the inso-  
 " lent messenger Lyndsay, and that they will re-  
 " fuse all communication with the British Cabi-  
 " net, until it has acknowledged the Sovereignty  
 " of the French People, and driven from the  
 " Court the infamous Calonne, that firebrand  
 " and odious instigator, that intriguing friend of  
 " Despotism, and malevolent Agent of an infa-  
 " mous Party.

" RESOLVED also, That the Society shall con-  
 " tinue its sittings twice a week, and that thanks  
 " shall be given to the Citizen de la Chesnaye,  
 " for his indefatigable zeal in procuring us light,  
 " intelligence, and subjects of information."

To preclude all doubt as to the authenticity of  
 the above communication, L<sup>e</sup> BRUN thus con-  
 cludes his Letter :

" THIS Decree has been made by the Society  
 " established at Rochester for the propagation of  
 " the Rights of Man."

THE effect of the above Letter is considerably  
 heightened by the circumstance, that the Society

at

at Rochester, from which the above Resolution proceeded, was so insignificant as not to be at all known at that place; and after various fruitless researches has been found to consist only of two or three obscure individuals. But nothing that tends to insult and menace the Government of this Country is too insignificant for the fraternal notice of the Convention.

MORE than sufficient has been already stated to convince the most incredulous of the hostile dispositions of France, and of her endeavours to spread among us the seeds of discord and revolt, for the purpose of subverting our Government and preparing us for the reception of French Liberty. Still, however, a kind of disguise was preserved—thread-bare and transparent indeed—but meant in some sort to cover the ultimate design, till matters should be more ripe for completion. But in a letter of Monsieur MONGE, Minister of the Marine, to the Sea-Ports, dated the 31st of December 1792, all reserve is laid aside, and the mask, which had been before alternately taken off and resumed, is thrown quite away.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE MINISTER  
OF MARINE TO THE SEA PORTS, DATED PARIS,  
DEC. 31, 1792.

“THE Government of England is arming,  
“and the King of Spain, encouraged by this, is  
“preparing

" preparing to attack us. These two Tyrannical  
 " Powers, after persecuting the Patriots on their  
 " own Territories, think, no doubt, that they  
 " shall be able to influence the judgment to be  
 " pronounced on the Traitor Louis. They hope  
 " to frighten us : but no ; a People who has  
 " made itself free ; a People who has driven out  
 " of the bosom of France, and as far as the distant  
 " borders of the Rhine, the terrible army of the  
 " Prussians and Austrians ; the People of France  
 " will not suffer laws to be dictated to them by  
 " any Tyrant.

" THE King and his Parliament mean to make  
 " war against us. Will the English Republicans  
 " suffer it ? Already these free men shew their  
 " discontent, and the repugnance which they  
 " have to bear arms against their Brothers, the  
 " French. Well ! we will fly to their succour :  
 " we will make a descent in the Island : we will  
 " lodge there Fifty Thousand Caps of Liberty ;  
 " we will plant there the sacred tree : and we  
 " will stretch out our arms to our Republican  
 " Brethren. The tyranny of their Government  
 " will soon be destroyed. Let every one of us be  
 " strongly impressed with this idea.

(Signed) "MONGE."

H

AFTER



AFTER such accumulated evidence of the un-  
 bounded ambition of France in general, and of her  
 particular views of aggression and hostility against  
 Great Britain, the Government of this country  
 would have shewn itself a very inattentive guardian  
 of the National honour and interests, if it had  
 suffered itself to be entrapped into confidence and  
 supineness by the delusory explanations of Mon-  
 sieur CHAUVELIN and the Executive Council ;  
 explanations calculated only to amuse, and which  
 could not have been accepted without affording a  
 sanction to those principles and proceedings which  
 had given such ground for offence and alarm.  
 There never was a period, at all distinguished  
 for its importance, when the line of duty was  
 so plain on the part of Administration. There  
 was so little room left for option, or even  
 for deliberation, as almost to preclude the claim  
 of merit for prudent resolves and sagacious mea-  
 sures ; while the public voice, with almost un-  
 precedented unanimity, declared the wishes and  
 the feelings of the Nation to be in perfect co-  
 incidence with its obvious interest. The conduct  
 of France had been so daring, insulting, and  
 aggressive, and the avowed principles of that  
 conduct were so subversive of the harmony and  
 quiet of Europe in general, as well as of the  
 safety, order, and independence of every distinct  
 State, that no explanation or disavowal could  
 afford

afford a satisfaction for the past, for a security for the future. Any thing short of a revocation of the obnoxious Decrees—a dereliction of the conquered territories—a recall of the French armies—an express renunciation of all views of aggrandizement and aggression, of all right to violate or disturb subsisting Treaties, and of all claims to interfere, upon any pretence, in the internal concerns of other countries—anything short of this would have left the political system and the domestic tranquillity of all Europe at the mercy of a people who had disclaimed all restraints of honour and justice, whose ambition was only rivalled by their perfidy, and whose insolence, increasing with their success, had arrogated the imperious right of dictating to the whole world.

BUT so far from any disposition being manifested by the persons exercising the Supreme Power in France to make the above necessary concessions, they maintain, even in their explanations with this country, the injurious principles upon which they had acted, and of which we had complained. They insist, with only an artful and evasory change of terms, on a right to regulate all other Governments, in a supposititious case, of which they make themselves the sole judges. By defending their unprovoked aggression on Holland (a

neutral Power, and an ally of Great Britain) in the affair of the Scheldt, they avow a claim of annulling at pleasure the most solemn and binding Treaties, and of violating the rights even of neutral Nations. They persist in this aggression, and declare their intention so to do without any redress, not merely during their war with another Power, but till a period the most indefinite and undefinable shall arrive, "the consolidation of the liberty of the Belgians." They even menace \* War, if such explanations as *these* should be deemed by us insufficient—if our language in return thereto should be such as they may chuse to call haughty—or if we even presume to put ourselves in a posture of defence, while France, with an armed force of half a million of men at her command (not to mention her naval preparations), was over-running a great part of Europe, and making daily additions to her immense territories. To render these *conciliatory* advances complete, they are followed by the insolent menace of \* *appealing to the People against the lawful Government of Great Britain.*

WHERE had been the dignity and the honour of this country if such insolence had been received with complacency, and returned with submission?

\* See Le Brun's Letter to Lord Grenville, dated January 7,

1793.

To



To say that we had not a Ministry capable of thus tarnishing the British name, is surely no very great compliment to those who preside at the political helm. No one who has a British heart in his bosom will, in any possible event, remember with regret that we did not bend the knee to the insolent upstart usurpers of France, who had acquired their power by sanguinary violence, who retain it by the influence of terror, and employ it in deeds at which Humanity stands aghast. Still, however, while dignity characterized our Councils, and firmness our measures—while we declared our resolution to accept no terms but such as would restore security and tranquillity to Europe, and preserve the independence of its respective States—and while we persevered with unremitting activity in forwarding those preparations the necessity of which has been since sufficiently evinced—it is pleasing to reflect, that we displayed a readiness, even to the last, to avert the calamities of war, and to hearken to any proposals that might be consistent with the indispensable objects we had in view. Thus Lord GRENVILLE, in his Answer of the 31st of December to the Note presented by Monsieur CHAUVELIN, says, “ It would have been  
 “ with pleasure that we should have seen here such  
 “ explanations, and such a conduct, as would have  
 “ satisfied the dignity and honour of England  
 “ with

“ See Le Brin's Letter to Lord Grenville, dated January 1793.

“with respect to what has already passed, and  
 “would have offered a sufficient security in  
 “future for the maintenance of that respect  
 “towards the Rights, the Government, and the  
 “Tranquillity of Neutral Powers, which they  
 “have on every account the right to expect.”

And even at the moment immediately previous to the commencement of hostilities, Lord AUCKLAND at the *Hague* received directions from his Majesty to accede to the proposal of DUMOURIER for a conference on a particular day : though that scheme was altogether frustrated by the unrestrainable eagerness of the Convention to begin the war : a strong proof of the impossibility of negotiating with an Assembly so rash and precipitate in its resolves, and totally regardless of every established form and rule. In short, while nothing was omitted on our part in the way of necessary preparation for an event which, from the conduct of France, seemed at least more than probable, so nothing consistent with national honour and sound policy was neglected to obviate the necessity of that event ; nor has a measure been adopted by us which was not either a requisite precaution for our immediate security, or necessary to preserve that character and consequence as a people, without which no security can long subsist.

THE

THE recal of Lord GOWER when his mission was *ipso facto* determined; and that by events of so shocking a nature, that it would have ill become a liberal and civilized nation to have sanctioned them by the presence of an Ambassador—the restrictions laid on the exportation of corn to France, when we could not have supplied the wants of that country without exposing ourselves to distress; and when also we knew that Jacobin Emissaries, the Propagandists of Insurrection, would have joyfully reduced us to scarcity, with a view of involving us in confusion—the regulations of the Alien Bill, when such numbers of desperate and blood-stained Frenchmen were daily flocking here for the most mischievous and horrid purposes—the omission to acknowledge a Republic which existed only in name, and possessed no kind of settled Government, no powers but what were provisional, and not even the faintest trace of a Constitution—the refusal to send an Ambassador to the Ephemeral Authority of France, and to commit the Royal Dignity by exposing the confidential Plenipo of the British Crown to a contested Embassy with the accepted Envoys of seditious English Clubs—and, finally, the dismissal of Monsieur CHAUVELIN, when by the death of his master he was become a private individual;



individual; (though he appeared willing to lend himself to any masters, and for any services, and even to obey the Regicides of his Sovereign, whose commission he had borne, and whose favours had been heaped upon him from his infancy);—these measures, however they may be represented by the demagogues of France, or by the factious of England, as acts of aggression, were clearly founded in prudent forecast and necessary precaution.

It is true, the Declaration of War by France was accompanied with other reasons of a still more futile nature—such as our prudent precaution respecting the most unstable, precarious, and ill-founded, of all paper currency, French assignats—such as our observing the outward testimonials of respect customary upon the death of a Foreign Sovereign, notwithstanding, in the particular instance, that Sovereign was termed by the Convention a Tyrant, and his death produced by foul rebellion, glaring injustice, and ferocious cruelty—with divers other pretences equally frivolous and absurd—so much so, indeed, that the small party in this country which loses no opportunity of vindicating French principles and politics, and of criminating the measures of

Great

Great Britain, have found it impossible to dignify these pretended provocations with serious notice.

IN a Declaration of War so founded, supported, and explained, it is impossible not to trace that decided pre-determination for hostility which is never at a loss for pretences to disturb the peace of Nations. But though the Declaration, taken by itself, is so deficient in assigning any motives at all adequate to its object, yet when viewed in connection with the previous conduct of France, it will appear perfectly consistent and intelligible. A single glimpse of the system of Fraternity—of the arrogant Decrees—of the insulting language used by the Convention, by French Ministers and Clubs—of the notorious communication with the seditious of this country—the vengeance vowed against Monarchy in general—and the audacious menaces thrown out against our own gracious Sovereign \*—a single glimpse of these things dispels all obscurity, and places the Declaration of War, with its grounds, its motives, and its objects, in full and open day.

\* It has been said in the Convention by Danton, that “they had thrown down a King’s head as a gauntlet to the Kings of Europe, and that the scaffolds erected in Westminster Hall for the eternal trial of Mr. Hastings, would serve for the Ministers and even for ——— himself.

NOTWITHSTANDING such a series of unprovoked, insolent, and intolerable aggression on the part of France, followed up by a Declaration of War, and a most perfidious commencement of hostilities, it is curious to see the Convention claim the merit of having exhausted all means compatible with the dignity of the REPUBLIC to avoid extremities. After what has passed, indeed, nothing which that Assembly can say or do is capable of exciting surprize. But it is truly astonishing (nay incredible, but for the fact) that Englishmen should be found who are daring enough to contend that we are the aggressors in hostility; and who, in all their reasonings upon the subject, chuse to take it for granted, that the *onus* lies upon us to justify the war.

AFTER the generous and magnanimous neutrality which this country has observed from the commencement of the Revolution, no evidence can surely be wanted to prove, that Great Britain was far from being disposed to interfere in the internal concerns of France. That neutrality has, beyond all doubt, been the means of involving us, at length, in a war. Still, however, it is not matter for regret; for its principle was just, and its observance highly honourable. But because we have the generosity to refrain from taking advantage of the distresses of others, are we to



have the timidity and meanness to submit to any insult or injury with which they may have the ingratitude to reward us? Should we, in the full enjoyment of all the advantages of a regular Government, and of a free, a happy, a long-established and much-beloved Constitution, allow them that right of meddling in our domestic affairs which we did not think ourselves intitled to with respect to them, though a prey to confusion and anarchy? Should we sacrifice all our dignity and consequence, and tamely submit to see our rights, and those of our allies, trampled upon—our internal tranquillity invaded—our Government, our Constitution, and our King, menaced and insulted—and all the sources of our own security, as well as of that of all Europe, cut off? or, Should we shew that the same spirit which is just and generous, is also, upon proper occasions, firm, intrepid, and brave? Indeed, upon a general review of the whole case, it is much more difficult to vindicate the lengthened moderation than the tardy energy of the British Government. Nor could the former (in the degree to which it has been carried) find any excuse in sound policy, if it had not been in exact coincidence with the sentiments and wishes of the whole nation.

The question, Whether it has been in the power of Great Britain on any terms to prevent

actual hostilities & may excite the curiosity of a Speculatist, but can furnish no important ground of inquiry for the Politician. For it is clear beyond all controversy, that war was only to be averted by means incompatible in every view with the dignity and permanent interests of this country. To have purchased a continuance of peace, we must have brooked past insults, and thereby have courted fresh ones—we must have connived at the unbounded projects of French Ambition, the alarming progress of French Arms, and the still more alarming spread of French Principles—we must have abandoned the interests of our Allies, broken our faith to them, renounced the obligation of Treaties, and given up our weight in the scale of Europe—finally, after having, in compliance with the requisition of **LE BRUN**, discontinued our preparations, we must have waited patiently for our own turn to be fraternized; and perhaps we might have been at length admitted to the honour of becoming a Department of France.

But it is pretended by those who plead the cause of France, that we have not made a fair trial of the effect of negociation; that the disposition shewn by the Convention to treat has been thwarted by the fastidious distance preserved by the English Government.

Government; and that during the intercourse which took place by way of negotiation, we neglected to specify with sufficient clearness and precision the nature and extent of our demands; from all which it is attempted to be inferred, that it is impossible now to say what might have been the result, if we had manifested a more conciliatory disposition. But a perusal of the Papers which have passed between the British Ministry and the Agents of the Convention will convince every one (unless determined not to be convinced), that a negotiation has existed which was adequate to every object which a negotiation could obtain; that the deviation from accustomed forms with which that negotiation was accompanied, did not create any difficulty; nor even constitute any part of the question discussed; that the refusal on our part to send and receive a formal Ambassador (whether that refusal was in other respects right or wrong) did not prevent a full and complete understanding of each other's sentiments and views; that the point of *etiquette* was surmounted; and that the channel of discussion *pro hac vice* was as open as if mutual Embassies had existed in all their forms. The language of Lord GRENVILLE was precise and intelligible as to the grounds of complaint on the part of England. In his Memorial, wherein precision and clearness seem to vie with



with manly British energy, the three causes of dissatisfaction arising from the Decree of the 19th of November—from the infraction of Treaties, the aggression upon our Ally, and the violation of neutrality in the affair of the Scheldt—and from the views of aggrandisement manifested by France, were detailed in terms the most explicit. Even upon the last of the three points, which in its nature was most liable to ambiguity and misunderstanding, can anything be more pointed and specific than the following passages in his Lordship's Letter of the 31st of December?

"THIS Government, adhering to the maxims which it has followed for more than a century, will never see with indifference, that France shall make herself, *either directly or indirectly*, Sovereign of the Low Countries, or general Arbitress of the Rights and Liberties of Europe.

"If France is really desirous of maintaining friendship and peace with England, she must shew herself disposed to renounce her views of aggression and aggrandisement, and to confine herself within her own Territories, without insulting other Governments, without disturbing their Tranquillity, without violating their Rights."

TO ANY one is free to contend, that these demands were exorbitant, but no one can deny that they were explicit. On the other hand, the answers and explanations of France, however evasory, sufficiently indicated a determination to refuse all satisfaction with respect to any one of the points in dispute : and to put the matter out of all doubt, the French Minister gave in his *ultimatum*, declaring, that if we did not accept the explanations that were offered (trifling and elusory as they were), France would consider itself at war with England. Could any negotiation have produced more decisive language than this ? Could any Treaty have gone beyond an *ultimatum* ? Could any discussion have terminated in a more precise point than that where one party says to another, " You must either accept my " answer, such as it is, and sit down quiet and satisfied, or war shall ensue ? " It would be the height of absurdity to pretend, that the most polished refinement and splendid superficial of diplomatic intercourse could have produced a different result. Is there any one who can believe for a moment, that France would have changed her system, renounced her plans, relinquished her principles, abandoned her conquests, and sacrificed all her successes, out of compliment to a few forms ? or, Is it credible that she would

" 21 have "

have accorded to our meanness and timidity what she refused to concede to our dignity and firmness?

THE circumstance of France having been willing to negotiate and explain, notwithstanding the interruption of all regular intercourse with our Government, is relied on, and it is all that can be relied on, in favour of the supposition that she was disposed to pursue pacific measures with Great Britain. But was it not an important and desirable object for her to be permitted to pursue, without any impediment from us, her schemes of conquest and aggrandisement? To attain that object by explanations tending to cast a mist upon our just grounds of complaint, to conceal her principles and her objects under a specious veil of imposing epithets, and to render the idea of war unpopular in this country, was certainly worth the experiment. And however difficult it might be to deceive the vigilance and penetration of the British Government, it might be thought possible to impose on the good sense or the honest feelings of the British people, at least with the assistance of those among us who were ready to adopt and re-echo every kind of argumentative fallacy that could be suggested by Gallic craft. The artifice has failed  
before



before the spirit and discernment of this Country; and it is now plain, both from the progress and the result of the negociation, that no satisfaction whatever was intended, or could have been obtained.

**CONCLUSION.**

THE foregoing review of the transactions leading to the War in which we are now engaged, may suggest a variety of important and useful reflections.

It is true, we find ourselves at length plunged into a situation which not only affords to Poets and to Orators some of their best topics for touching the passions, but which may justly be considered as one of the most grievous calamities to which a state of Society is exposed. But never, from the beginning of the world to this eventful period, was War attended with such solid and satisfactory grounds for consolation, as we are at present entitled to; nor with such cogent motives for vigour, exertion, unanimity, as should stimulate us in its pursuit. We may reflect with satisfaction, not merely that it was unsought by

us, but that it was out of our power to avoid it; at least without an entire sacrifice of our National consequence and respectability, and of our faith and honour as a People; and that even by such a sacrifice we should in all appearance have only warded it off for the moment, and have had to encounter it hereafter under circumstances infinitely more disadvantageous. We may also reflect with some degree of satisfaction, that the calamities of war, great as they are, fall vastly short of those which stared us in the face, if we had purchased present peace on the terms which alone afforded us any chance of preserving it.

THE questions, therefore, which are so current in the mouths of some men, What can we gain—what may we not lose by the war? are calculated only to mislead, and to excite an unfair prejudice. These questions falsely assume that we have had an option, and that war has been our deliberate choice. But nothing can be more obvious than that the war, both in form and in substance, is, on our part, A WAR OF DEFENCE. If, upon a calculation of profit and loss, we had resolved on hostilities, we should then have been charged by these very Querists with carrying on war as a trade, and with speculating in the lives of men.

BUT

BUT even to such enquiries it may be satisfactorily answered, that if the prosperity of this country is such as leaves us nothing to wish for, nothing further to attain, the object of the War is no less than to preserve and secure whatever we now possess; or, to borrow the energetic language of Mr. Powis, “we may gain by the war all that we could lose if we did not engage in it.” Every thing which is and ought to be dear to us—our foreign consequence—our political weight—our national honour and independence—our domestic tranquillity—and, to sum up all in one word, OUR HAPPY CONSTITUTION, the source of all our greatness and of all our welfare, have been insulted, menaced and attacked.—We are hurried into a war, because we did not chuse to abandon these advantages; and it is NOW BY WAR ALONE THAT WE CAN PLACE THEM OUT OF THE REACH OF FURTHER INSULT. Let *that* consideration animate us to exertion; let it call forth all our energy—and let every one forego the name, as he must disgrace the character of an Englishman, who would harbour a thought of peace, till that object shall be completely attained and secured.

It is not, however, by selfish considerations alone that we are called to exertion in the pre-



sent war. The cause in which we are engaged is not partial, but general; not the cause of one, but of all.—Upon its success depends the welfare of Europe, and perhaps of the whole World:—upon its success depend the important questions, Whether Government shall exist—Whether Religion shall retain any influence in social life—Whether laws shall continue to bind, and Justice be anywhere administered—Whether, in short, any link of the social chain shall be preserved unbroken?—or, Whether mankind shall be uncivilized, and reduced to a state of more than Gothic barbarism, and the whole of this Quarter of the Globe, like France, become at once the licensed Theatre of every crime?

WHEN consequences of such magnitude depend upon the fate of our arms, it should excite our gratitude to Divine Providence to be able to reflect, at such a period, on the wealth and prosperity of the Nation—the extent of its resources—the strength and excellent condition of its natural bulwark, the Navy—the intrepid bravery of its Sea and Land Forces—the harmony of its People—the energy of their character—and their zealous, unalterable, and rational attachment both to the person of their Sovereign and to the Constitution of their Country. Our wonderful and almost miraculous progress in a short period of time from  
distress

distress and weakness to unprecedented strength and prosperity, seems intended by the All-wise Disposer of Events as the means not only of our own preservation, but of restoring order and tranquillity to other Countries.

BUT with all our own advantages, it is indispensably necessary that we should avail ourselves fully of the assistance and co-operation of the other Powers now engaged with us in the same contest. Our interest is closely linked with theirs in the event of that contest. We were not menaced till they were defeated; but no sooner was the cause of France at all distinguished by success against them, than her insolence broke out in those daring outrages which have so justly excited our alarm and our indignation. A continuation of that success would but render her more formidable, more insolent, and more aspiring. Should she prevail in making them a prey to her ambition, we might then find her, with such an accession of strength, even an overmatch for ourselves; and it would be too much to hope, that we should escape being drawn into the vortex which had swallowed up the rest of Europe.

INDEED, the common welfare and security of all nations call loudly for the exertion of their united efforts,

efforts, before it be too late, to check the progress, to chastise the insolence, and to repel the ambition of France. The best interests of humanity—the well being, the existence of society are at stake. A common enemy should be resisted by united force. It is alike the interest of every Government and of every people to resist the progress of principles that strike at the root of all established Government, that tend to subvert all constituted authority, and to destroy that necessary subordination which is the very basis of society.

It is, in all human probability, a most fortunate circumstance for the happiness of mankind, that France has so openly displayed that intemperate spirit of universal aggression by which she was actuated, and which has at once connected all other States in the same interest, and drove them to mutual co-operation in their common defence. There is every reason to conclude, that with all the additional strength she derives from her maniacal rage, she must be repelled by the collective force she has so rashly provoked.—A little more policy on her part might have rendered her infinitely more formidable;—but happily extreme wickedness is in general as distant from prudence as it is from virtue; and of that devoted people it may apparently



rently be said with more than poetical justice,  
*"Quos Deus vult perdere prius dementat."*

THE success, however, of the great cause in which so many nations are engaged, and which involves their dearest interests, depends upon their acting together in a firm and well-cemented union. They are inseparably connected in the same fate—they must succeed or fall together. Till their common object be obtained—till their mutual security be effected, by completely repressing the ambition of France, they should form an indissoluble phalanx. And however well they may, under the pressure of the moment, feel the necessity of reciprocal assistance, it will not be amiss for them to keep in mind the following fact recorded in history.

A SINGLE combatant, hitherto unwounded (the survivor of three), remaining opposed to three antagonists, who were all bleeding, and finding himself unequal to their united force, though able to cope with each of them singly, found means by artifice to separate them from each other—and then with ease he successively overcame by his force those whom he had thus divided by his fraud.

BOTH

BOTH the safety and honour of Great Britain require her to concur with spirit, cordiality, and vigour in the above union. The language of those who call this a co-operation with Despots to check the progress of Liberty, is vain and idle rant. Where the object is to escape destruction, wisdom justifies alliances, connections, and plans, which would, perhaps, in another case be inexpedient. But a regard even for liberty would call upon us to check, by all possible means, the progress of that anarchy which France is endeavouring to render universal. It is only by defeating those endeavours that the avenues of true Freedom can be kept open, either for herself or the rest of the world. That unhappy country was never in any period of its history so apparently far removed from the acquisition of liberty as at present; though, like the madman, she fancies herself in full and exclusive possession of it—and ravingly exults in the distempered idea, while her phrenzy alone would incapacitate her from enjoying the reality\*. And as to other countries, the harmony of the general system must be restored,

\* Nothing can more strongly prove the delusion of this wretched people, than the circumstance of their glorying in their ideal Sovereignty, and believing that they enjoy the boasted privilege of being free to chuse their own Government; while, by a subsisting Decree, they are forbidden, under pain of death, to propose the restoration of Monarchy.

before

before the Sun of Freedom can generally diffuse his benign and vivifying radiance. It was never intended for France to be the sun or the centre of that system. Her attempts to become so, have already produced dreadful confusion; and the balance must be regained, by confining her to her proper orbit, or universal chaos must ensue.

For a people to acquire liberty, they must first be independent of foreign sway. Internal freedom cannot consist with external tyranny. But when the different nations of Europe shall be left to themselves, and freed from the danger of such dependence, then in the progress of civilization, and by the operation of natural causes, they will all progressively understand and obtain their Civil Rights; and without any relaxation of order, or forcible dissolution of constituted authority, the power of Despotism will gradually subside into the mild dominion of Laws.

In every point of view, therefore, the present safety and the future and permanent welfare of all Europe, call at this juncture for its combined and vigorous efforts to crush the ambitious projects of France—and to preserve those common interests of all States, without which no State can improve, or even retain its separate rights and advantages.

L

It



It is clearly for the happiness of every people—nay even of the deluded people of France, that such a confederacy should be formed, and should succeed. For when by such means the independence of States, the obligation of Treaties, and of the Laws of Nations, shall be restored; the Anarchy of France, deprived of its necessary fuel, must be extinguished, and give place to some kind of regular Government;—which will of course respect other Governments, and recognize those principles that are indispensable to general order and harmony.

In such a confederacy it well becomes the GENIUS of BRITAIN to concur. The Guardian Genius of this favoured Isle, the seat of genuine Freedom, and the Temple of Humanity, can never be more auspiciously engaged than in vanquishing the Fiend of Discord and Anarchy—and thereby restoring TRANQUILLITY TO NATIONS AND HAPPINESS TO MAN.

**T H E E N D.**